REMARKS

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-18 are now pending in this application.

Claims 8, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With respect to claims 8-10, the rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 8-10 have been amended to be more clear, concise, and exact. Thus, claims 8-10, as amended, are believed to be in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshikawa (U.S. Patent 6,222,859) (hereinafter Yoshikawa).

With respect to claims 1-18, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a telephone communication system comprising:

"a public network,
an internet service provider network, and
a plurality of telephone sets accommodated in the public network,
wherein when a calling telephone set, which is a subscriber to the internet service provider network, provides connection point data for making internet service telephone communication to a called telephone set via the public network, the called telephone set receiving the connection point data connects itself to the internet service provider network according to the connection point data, and the calling telephone set connects itself to the internet service provider network."

The telephone communication system including the above-quoted features allows for a calling telephone set and a called telephone set to communicate over a single internet service provider (ISP) network. The invention allows for the telephone sets to communicate over a single ISP network even if only the calling telephone set is a subscriber of the ISP network. The called telephone set is able to connect to the same ISP network because the

calling telephone set sends connection point data to the called telephone set. By communicating over a single ISP network, a high speech quality for internet telephone communication can be achieved because the ISP can provide a guaranteed level of service (i.e. QoS and packet delay). Without the present invention, in order for the telephone sets to communicate over the same ISP network, both sets would have to be subscribers of the same ISP. Thus, the present invention eliminates the need for subscription contracts between a telephone set user and multiple ISPs. By reducing the number of required contracts, the present invention reduces the amount of contract expenditures. Advantages such as those described above are discussed in the specification (e.g. page 15, lines 1-15; page 18, line 10 to page 19, line 4).

Yoshikawa neither discloses nor suggests a telephone communication system including the above-quoted features with telephone sets communicating over the same ISP network. Instead, the two terminals (telephone sets) in Yoshikawa are each connected to a different ISP network (see Yoshikawa figure 3; column 5, lines 46-55; column 10, lines 10-13). From Yoshikawa, figure 3, it is apparent that terminal 1 is connected to ISP-A and that terminal 2 is connected to ISP-B. Thus, communication packets sent from terminal 1 to terminal 2 must pass through both ISP-A and ISP-B (see Yoshikawa column 5, lines 63-67). Terminal 2 is not able to connect to ISP-A directly because terminal 1 does not provide connection point data to terminal 2 in order to allow terminal 2 to connect to ISP-A. Instead, terminal 1 only provides its own IP address to terminal 2 (see Yoshikawa column 8, lines 31-36).

Since communication between terminals in Yoshikawa occurs over multiple ISP networks, Yoshikawa is not able to guarantee a certain level of service quality from a single ISP as with the present invention. Furthermore, for the two terminals in Yoshikawa to communicate over the same ISP network, it would be necessary for both terminals to have a contract with the same ISP, which would not be required by the present invention.

Therefore, Yoshikawa neither discloses nor suggests the telephone communication system of claim 1 and, hence, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Independent claims 2 and 3 recite telephone communication systems similar to the telephone communication system of claim 1. Thus, claims 2 and 3 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Independent claims 8, 9, and 10 recite internet communication methods similar to the operation of the telephone

communication system of claim 1. Thus, claims 8, 9, and 10 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend.

The application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 14, 2003

David A. Blumenthal
Reg. No. 26,257

Foley & Lardner
Customer Number: 23392

23392
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5109
Telephone: 202-672-5300
Facsimile: 202-672-5399